IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE A.K.BASHEER

MONDAY, THE 4TH JUNE 2007 / 14TH JYAISHTA 1929

W.P.(C).No. 16881 of 2007(I)

PETITIONER:

SUSEELA E.S., D/O SIVARAMAN,
AGED 44 YEARS, HEAD MISTRESS, P.M.S.A.L.P.SCHOOL,
MUTHUPARAMBA, P.O.KIZHISEERI, KONDOTTY,
MALAPPURAM DISTRICT.
RESIDING AT : HARIPRIYA, MUTHUPARAMBA P.O.,
KODOTTY, MALAPPURAM DISTRICT.

BY ADV. SMT.LATHA PRABHAKARAN
SRI.K.M.JAMALUDHEEN

RESPONDENTS:

---

1. THE STATE OF KERALA REP.BY
THE SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT,
GENERAL EDUCATION DEPARTMENT, SECRETARIAT,
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM.

2. THE ASSISTANT EDUCATIONAL OFFICER,
KIZHISSERI.

BY GOVERNMENT PLEADER SRI.A.J.VARGHESE

THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION ON 04/06/2007, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING:

A.K.BASHEER, J.

W.P.(C)No.16881 OF 2007

Dated this the 4th day of June, 2007

JUDGMENT

Petitioner is stated to be working as Headmistress in an Aided Lower Primary School. According to her, she was initially appointed as Headmistress with effect from December 3, 1986. It is admitted by the petitioner that at the time of her initial appointment, she was not qualified since she had not passed the Account Test. Later, petitioner was reverted in terms of Ext.P1 order. It is the case of the petitioner that she passed the Account Test (lower) and became qualified with effect from May 23, 1989. Consequently, she was promoted and appointed as Headmistress again with effect from that date as could be seen from Ext.P2. The grievance of the petitioner is that approval of her appointment is being delayed for no apparent justification. Respondent no.2 had rejected the claim for approval without any valid reason. It is pointed out that Ext.P4 revision petition has been preferred before the Government in this regard highlighting all the relevant aspects of the case.

2. I do not propose to consider the merit of the above contentions, in view of the limited prayer made by the learned counsel at the Bar. He submits that petitioner will be satisfied, if an appropriate direction is issued to respondent no.1 to consider and pass orders on Ext.P4 revision petition expeditiously. Learned Government Pleader submits that an appropriate decision on Ext.P4 will be taken without any delay.

3. In the above facts and circumstances, writ petition is disposed of with a direction to respondent no.1 to consider and pass orders on Ext.P4 strictly on its merit and in accordance with law as expeditiously as possible, at any rate within four months from the date of receipt of a copy of this judgment. Needless to mention that the petitioner and the manager of the school shall be afforded sufficient opportunity to be heard before any decision is taken on Ext.P4. Petitioner shall produce a copy of the writ petition along with a certified copy of the judgment before respondent no.1 for compliance.

Writ petition is disposed of as above.

A.K.BASHEER, JUDGE

jes